U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/743,332

Response filed August 19, 2005

Reply to OA dated May 31, 2005

<u>REMARKS</u>

Claim 2 has been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the

subject matter to which the applicant regards as his invention. The applicant respectfully submits

that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the

Office Action dated May 31, 2005.

Claims 1 - 4 are currently pending in this patent application, claim 1 being an independent

claim.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 1 - 4 would be allowable if

rewritten or amended in the manner suggested in the third and fourth full paragraphs on page 3 of

the outstanding Action.

The drawings are objected to for the specific reason that reference numeral 45, discussed in

the applicant's specification, is <u>not</u> illustrated in the applicant's drawings. The applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration of these objections.

<del>-</del>5-

Reply to OA dated May 31, 2005

In reviewing the applicant's specification and drawings, "rods 45, 45", discussed in lines 11 -

15, page 7 of the applicant's specification, should read as: "rods 55, 55". In other words, the "rods

55, 55" are discussed in lines 20 - 23, page 7 of the applicant's specification as being "eccentrically

connected to the shaft 50" and shown in, e.g., the applicant's Figure 4.

Accordingly, instead of amending the applicant's drawings, the applicant has amended "rods

45, 45" (in line 12, page 7 of the applicant's specification) to read: "rods 55, 55".

The applicant respectfully requests that the above-noted amendments to the specification be

entered, and that the outstanding objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

The specification has been objected to because the Examiner is of the opinion that: "[i]t is

not clear as to what the shaft that is rotatable within a horizontal plane is in reference to." The

applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this objection.

½ See, specifically, lines 16-18, page 2 of the outstanding Action.

-6-

Reply to OA dated May 31, 2005

Here, the applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the applicant's comments below

concerning similar comments made by the Examiner regarding the claims. That is, for reasons more

fully discussed below, instead of amending the specification, the applicant has amended the claims

in order to overcome the Examiner's outstanding objection to the specification.

Claims 1 - 4 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for the same reason

discussed above with respect to the specification. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration

of this rejection.

As to the Examiner's comment that the phrase "a shaft rotatable within a horizontal plane"

recited in claim 2 appears not to be supported in the applicant's specification, such objection can be

overcome by deleting the phrase "rotatable within a horizontal plane" from claim 2. As such, the

applicant has amended claim 2 so as to delete therefrom the phrase "rotatable within a horizontal

plane."

-7-

Reply to OA dated May 31, 2005

In view of the above, the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 USC §112, first

paragraph, and the outstanding objection to the specification is in order, and is therefore respectfully

solicited.

For similar reasons discussed above, claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 USC §112,

second paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

The applicant's comments above with respect to the amendments to claim 2 should

sufficiently address this outstanding rejection of the claims under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 USC §112, second

paragraph, is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended,

are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

-8-

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/743,332 Response filed August 19, 2005

Reply to OA dated May 31, 2005

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number

indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an

appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other

fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,

HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

Mel R. Quintos

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 31,898

MRQ/lrj/ipc

Atty. Docket No. 031351

**Suite 1000** 

1725 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2930

23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

-9-